

## Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/728,701

Applicant(s)

MUHLESTEIN, MARK

Examiner

Kaveh Abrishamkar

Art Unit

2131

### All Participants:

(1) Kaveh Abrishamkar.

(2) Jordan Becker (Reg. No. 39,602).

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 6 August 2007

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

### Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

### Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*103 rejection over Tso in view of Bates*

Claims discussed:

*94 and 115*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Tso et al. (U.S. Patent 6,088,803) and Bates et al. (U.S. Patent 6,721,721)*

### Part II.

#### SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*The Examiner stated that if all the limitations of independent claims 103 and 109, were incorporated in claims 94 and 115, then the claims would be differentiate over the Cited Prior Art (CPA). The attorney authorized the proposed amendments.*

### Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)